Comments on DWRSIM Model studies used in CALFED's Programmatic EIS/EIR
Contact: Pal Sandu, 653-1072

Information on DWRSIM Model studies conducted for Storage and Conveyance component of the CALFED Program, is mainly included in the following reports.

1. Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact report, March 1998

2. Phase II Interim Report, March 1998

3. Appendix On Surface Water Resources, March 1998
   1) Technical Report Affected Environment
   2) Technical Report Environmental Consequences.

Three other reports; Storage and Conveyance Refinement Process Overview, No Action Alternative, and Project Alternatives have the same information as the above reports. The following comments on these reports are provided as to the study assumptions, procedures or operation rules and conclusions drawn using the DWRSIM study results.

1. Evaluation of the current resource conditions or existing conditions is based on DWRSIM Study 1995d06a-calfed-558. The report on Affected Environment refers to this study as SWRCB Study 1995c06f-SWRCB-469, which is in error. Information on the evaluation of current resource conditions (Page 10) and supporting tables and charts need updating as results are from last year's evaluation.

2. Modeling assumptions for existing conditions incorporated into the Technical Report on Environmental Consequences (Pages 4 to 8), are the same as shown on the Hydrology and Operations Section Web Page except Vernalis flow criteria is based on VAMP instead of Vernalis flow ratios mentioned on Page 7. Also, the No Action Study 516 SWP and CVP demand information (pages 8 & 9) is somewhat different than the Web Page.

3. In DWRSIM studies for CALFED, partial CVPIA (b)(2) Actions have been assumed and differ for the existing conditions, No Action and alternatives studies. The Existing conditions study is based on VAMP where as No Action and alternative studies use Vernalis flow ratios for CVP and SWP exports. Also, AFRP minimum flow criteria for Stanislaus River at Goodwin, was applied to No Action and alternative studies which is not used in the existing conditions study. CALFED plans to modify studies with CVPIA(b)(2) Actions before Final Phase II Report.

4. Results presented in Technical Report on Environmental Consequences (all tables), should be revised with the latest information on Web Page. Also, assumed diversion and discharge capacity for In-Delta Storage in model studies (Page 13) is 5,000 cfs instead of 15,000 cfs.

5. Results given in the Technical appendices, Phase II Interim Report and Programmatic EIS/EIR Report are not the same. For example Figure 28 in the Technical report on Environmental Consequences and the Programmatic EIS/EIR (page 6.1-70), have been updated where as figures in the Phase II Interim Report (pages 125 and 126), have old information. Sensitivity studies information (page 128) in the Phase II Interim Report is current except deliveries for Alternative 3 (with storage) are in error.

6. In-Delta Storage description in Phase II Interim Report (page 67), water use is mentioned as environmental, In-Delta water supply or for water quality needs. However, DWRSIM studies assumed In-Delta storage for SWP exports only. No additional programming was done for In-Delta operations in DWRSIM.

7. As stated in storage descriptions under the Variable Program Elements (pages 66 to 70) in the Phase II Interim Report, no DWRSIM studies were conducted for enlargement of Shasta, Millerton and Los Vaqueros reservoirs. Also, Garzas Reservoir was not evaluated in DWRSIM studies.

8. Storage and conveyance studies assume existing DMC and California Aqueduct capacities. This constraint is there in all DWRSIM studies and limits water supply deliveries south of the Delta.